



COURTNEY STANIFORD & GREGORY LLP
P.O. BOX 9686
SAN JOSE CA 95157

COPY MAILED

DEC 02 2008

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of	:	
Tom, Alfred	:	
Application No. 10/807,840	:	DECISION ON PETITION
Filed: March 23, 2004	:	
Attorney Docket No. KNTN.P005	:	

This is a decision on the petition under the unintentional provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b), filed January 3, 2008, to revive the above-identified application.

The petition is **GRANTED**.

The application became abandoned for failure to reply in a timely manner to the Restriction Requirement mailed May 21, 2007, which set a shortened statutory period for reply of one (1) month or thirty (30) days (whichever is later). No extensions of time under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a) were obtained. Accordingly, the application became abandoned on June 22, 2007. A Notice of Abandonment was mailed December 28, 2007.

The petition satisfies the requirements of 37 CFR 1.137(b) in that petitioner has supplied (1) the reply in the form of a response to the Restriction Requirement, (2) the petition fee of \$770.00 and (3) a proper statement of unintentional delay.

It is not apparent whether the statement of unintentional delay was signed by a person who would have been in a position of knowing that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional. Nevertheless, in accordance with 37 CFR 10.18, the statement is accepted as constituting a certification of unintentional delay. However, in the event that petitioner has no knowledge that the delay was unintentional, petitioner must make such an inquiry to ascertain that, in fact, the delay was unintentional. If petitioner discovers that the delay was intentional, petitioner must notify the Office.

Further, it is not apparent whether the person signing the instant petition currently has the power of attorney or authorization of agent to prosecute this patent. In accordance with 37 CFR 1.34(a), the signature appearing on the petition shall constitute a representation to the United States Patent and Trademark Office that he/she is authorized to represent the particular party in whose behalf he/she acts. While, a courtesy copy of this decision is being mailed to the person signing the instant petition, all future correspondence will be directed to the address currently of record until such time as appropriate instructions are received to the contrary.

Telephone inquiries concerning this decision should be directed to Joan Olszewski at (571)272-7751.

This application is being referred to Technology Center AU 2622 for appropriate action by the Examiner in the normal course of business on the reply received.

/Liana Walsh/
 Liana Walsh
 Petitions Examiner
 Office of Petitions

cc: Kenneth C. Brooks
 Thelen Reid Brown Raysman & Steiner LLP
 2225 E. Bayshore Road, Suite 210
 Palo Alto CA 94303